

Dr. Himes has shown me no reason for altering one word of my article, where I summed up that "the effects of hybridization . . . are bad, both biologically and socially," and ended, "Socially, however, the complexities of the civilized mind militate against the harmony of such [mixed] married lives, and this must have great weight with the eugenicist."

KENNETH B. AIKMAN.

London.

To the Editor, Eugenics Review

SIR,—Dr. Norman E. Himes says it would take him almost fifteen pages to dispose of me and Dr. Aikman. I am afraid it would take me very much more than that to dispose of him! I will, therefore, try to confine myself to the major lacunæ in his reading, and answer only his main objections to my thesis.

(a) In regard to his reply to my claim that "culture, in so far as it is social harmony and order, must be the product of an ordered, harmonious man, and that creators of culture were ordered and harmonious as the result of the inbreeding they practised," I should first like to point out that anyone to-day who questions that a man's expression, whether in culture or anything else, can be different from or contrary to what that man is himself, is assuming a dualism in the human organism which is no longer tenable. This dualism is based on a Socratic hoax by which it is no longer scientific to be duped; Dr. Himes is obviously still duped by it. Secondly, I should like to know how and why Dr. Himes concluded that I believed the above claim to be new, and how and why he is satisfied that it has often been refuted. He says so, and I am aware of the wild and prejudiced statements to that effect; but (though I have read the subject of consanguinity in the literature of seven or eight countries) I have not yet seen the thesis satisfactorily refuted.

(b) In reply to my claim that all early cultures were the product of nations or peoples confined within natural or artificial boundaries which made the exclusion of foreigners and the practice of endogamy inevitable, I should be glad to know why Dr. Himes says "not all early cultures were so confined." Which were not, and what was their ultimate influence on us? I know of no great early culture that was not so confined, and the list I gave was surely exhaustive enough. The difference between us is not merely our use and interpretation of the word "great." It is due partly to Dr. Himes's failure to recognize my implicit argument regarding the subsequent influence of such cultures on us, and partly to his failure to read the report of my paper carefully. He was sufficiently inaccurate not to see that the report gave merely the "substance" of my paper.*

(c) He says that these cultures—and I obviously refer to those of the Egyptians, the Jews and the Greeks, in making the claim—were not incestuous, and that my evidence is "hand-picked." My reply is that Dr. Himes does not know the relevant facts. The Egyptians, as every authority from Diodorus to G. Maspero states, were certainly incestuous in any known sense of that word, and were so not only in their governing but also in their middle and lower classes. And, in the sense of our own and civilized Europe's tables of prohibited degrees of affinity, so were the Jews and the Greeks. Furthermore, all these people were jealous of the purity of their blood and declined the *connubium* of foreign races. See all relevant histories, from Herodotus to Wilkinson, and from the Old Testament to Bury.

(d) He says we do not owe the harmony existing between our social institutions solely to these early civilizations. I said: "What little beauty and harmony our own culture possesses it owes entirely to them" (i.e. these endogamic cultures); and my reply is that it is difficult enough to see beauty or harmony in any culture, whether of Western Europe or America, to-day; but certainly, where it exists—in the family (now fast being broken up), in the degree of national integration still surviving through ideas, and in the order produced through institutions such as justice, communal feeling, and duty to the leader of the state (this integration, too, is being rapidly destroyed), as well as in the beauty of all our principal arts (also necessarily dying now)—every position that matters was first conquered by these ancient cultures.

(e) He also asks what I mean by disharmony of inheritance in man caused by lack of inbreeding. Let me reply in the words of Professor F. A. E. Crew: "The fact that there are inherent differences in the size of organs and parts is of profound significance, when it is remembered that it involves the inevitable sequel that racial and other crossings can lead to serious disharmony."* Truth to tell, the evidence of the fact is overwhelming. In a book I am preparing on the subject, I have found it impossible to include even half of the evidence I have collected. Does Dr. Himes know of Darbshire, and of Miss R. M. Fleming's recent work? If not, let him begin by studying both.

(f) He says I point to an instinct towards homogeneity—"a mere figment" of my imagination. Does Dr. Himes know that the existence of such an instinct has been observed by almost everyone from the Greeks of Homer's (*Odyssey*, XVII, 218) and Plato's day (*Symposium*, 195b, *Laws*, 733) down to a colleague of his own, Boswell H. Johnson?† Does he know that Karl Pearson proved its existence by a statistical inquiry,‡ and that Dr. J. B. Rice agrees with Pearson's conclu-

* *Organic Inheritance in Man*, p. 125.

† *EUGENICS REVIEW*, XIV, p. 258.

‡ *Grammar of Science*, 2nd edition, pp. 429, 431, 436.

* See *EUGENICS REVIEW*, January 1932, footnote, p. 147.

sion? Has he heard of Paul Popenoe (*Modern Marriage*, pp. 38-40), of Lorenz, the great genealogist (see *Lehrbuch der gesamten wissenschaftlichen Genealogie*), of Darwin (*Var. of Plants and Anim. under Domest.*, Vol. II), of J. P. Lott and W. A. Goddijn (*Hybridization among Human Races in South Africa*, *Genetica*, 1928), Dr. H. Berkusky (*Die Sexuelle Moral der Naturvölker: Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft*, 12 Jahrg. Heft. 12), of Pastor Agbebi (*Papers on Inter-Racial Problems*, Ed. by G. Spiller: *The West African Problem*, p. 344), F. L. Hoffmann (*Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro*, pp. 195-6), Bryk (*Neger Eros*, p. 115), Professor Nieuwenhuis (*The Genesis of Marriage*, p. 74), of Keyserling's *Book of Marriage*? I am giving a merely superficial survey of some of the authorities who claim a natural desire of like for like, whether in animals, or in civilized or in uncivilized men of various races. And, finally, we know the strict endogamic rules of the Egyptians, Jews and Greeks, and their hatred of the foreigner. Does Dr. Himes know that the ancestors of the Anglo-Saxon people had similar rules, as did also the ancient Britons? I challenge Dr. Himes to show me where the instinct of homogeneity does not exist, except among modern degenerate stocks.

(g) Dr. Himes says history refutes my claim that cultural decay is due to excessive outbreeding. What history? Let him follow the history of an ancient people, whether of Sparta, Athens or Rome, and let him see whether he can impartially declare that there is not a constant and repeated connexion between disintegration or decay and uncontrolled and extensive miscegenation.

It is unfortunate for Dr. Himes's case that he seems unaware of the fact that all the essential achievements of Egyptian culture were made while the race was quite homogeneous and unmixed. It is also unfortunate for his case that when the Egyptians were homogeneous and practising inbreeding, they attained to a great uniformity—a morphological standardization which gave way to differentiation and variation only after they became mixed. This is established by definite findings recorded by Grafton Elliot Smith (see his *Ancient Egypt*, 2nd edition, 1923), and is demonstrated visually by his plate showing mandibles on page 133. But another and most welcome confirmation of the fact was sent to me not long ago by a distinguished dentist. This gentleman, apparently unaware of the inbreeding and incest prevailing in all classes in Ancient Egypt, had noticed an extraordinary uniformity between a series of Ancient Egyptian mandibles, "a uniformity not expected and never seen among mandibles recovered from European

cemeteries," and he asked me about the ancient Egyptians, and for evidence of their inbreeding and incest. (His work will, I understand, appear very soon in the form of a monograph.) Here was quite independent and impartial evidence against Dr. Himes's contention that it had not been proved that disharmonies, such as those I speak of, do not occur in inbred stocks.

But, unless he believes that we are fallen angels, subject to different laws from those which hold sway over animals, why should he stubbornly doubt this fact, seeing that F. A. E. Crew writes: "Inbreeding leads to a rapid increase in homozygosity, and when this state has been achieved, stability and uniformity will be reached."*

He says the space I devoted to showing that inbreeding *per se* did not necessarily result in biological deterioration was "so much wasted effort." But is it not now evident that if I had not "wasted" that space, or if the facts bearing on that matter had been eliminated by you, Sir, he would have said I had not advanced a single fact to support my statement?

I think I have said enough to show the true worth of Dr. Himes's criticism. I will, however, give one last instance—his gibe at my suggestion that the increase in insanity and mental defectiveness "may be due to excessive miscegenation of race and type." Has he heard of Dr. H. Hoffman of Tübingen, and of his claim that an important pathogenic principle in human psychology is the disharmony of the genotype or hereditary constitution of an individual?† And does he know that ever since the Romans, to whom the word "hybrid" was a synonym for "fool,"‡ people of mixed blood have been regarded as mentally suspect? What does Davenport say? "A hybridized people will tend to be restless, dissatisfied, ineffective . . . and much of the crime and insanity [is due] to the inheritance of badly adjusted mental and temperamental differences."

As to my claim regarding the present increase of insanity, at which he again scoffs, let him consult one of his own countrymen, Dr. Cole Davis, a psychiatrist of note, who, speaking a short while ago of the insane, said: "The increase of such persons is at the rate of 10,000 a year; a few years ago it was only 3,000 a year." And Dr. Cole Davis added that unless America decided to destroy some of these people, the burden they impose would crush the State.

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI.

London.

* *Heredity*, 1928, p. 65.

† *Die seelischen Grundlagen des Charakters: Konstitution und Charakter*, p. 71.

‡ *Martial*, VIII, 122.

* *Racial Hygiene*, p. 262.